





# 'Thoughts on Slavery,'

REBUTTED BY

## OTHER THOUGHTS ON THE SAME SUBJECT,

BEING

A REVIEW OF A PAMPHLET ISSUED FROM THE PRESS OF  
DANIEL BIXBY & CO.....LOWELL, MASS. 1848.

---

O execrable Son! so to aspire  
Above his brethren; to himself assuming  
Authority usurp'd, from God not given.  
He gave us only over beast, fish, fowl,  
Dominion absolute; that right we hold  
By his donation; but man over men  
He made not lord; such title to himself  
Reserving, human left from human free.

MILTON.

---

LOWELL:  
PUBLISHED BY MILTON BONNEY.  
1849.

C 1766  
E 449  
. T 48  
1849

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1848,  
By MILTON BONNEY,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

DICKINSON PRINTING ESTABLISHMENT.....DAMRELL & MOORE.  
16 DEVONSHIRE STREET, BOSTON.

# REVIEW

OF

## "THOUGHTS ON SLAVERY."

---

AN anonymous pamphlet of seventy pages, under the above title, has lately issued from the press of Bixby and Co., Lowell, Mass. It is an elaborate vindication and defence of negro slavery. The style of the book is polished, flowing, and vigorous; and its doctrines, which are of a startling character, are set forth with boldness and candor.

We propose to examine the principal positions of this essay, with the respect due to sincerity and ability, but at the same time with the freedom demanded by truth.

Our author starts with the position, undoubtedly a true one, that slavery has become the most exciting topic of the day. To our country, thanks to the late Mexican war, it has indeed become a question of portentous magnitude, threatening to array section against section in deadly hostility, and to lay in ruins the fair fabric of government, reared by the wisdom of our patriot sires. What heart, that surveys the prospect before us, but must be appalled by the dark

cloud that hangs, like a presage of death, over its once bright and smiling scenes? Already is the cup of trembling, which the Divine Providence has indissolubly linked to national wrong, held to our lips. We begin to taste its bitterness; and, unless we withdraw our hand, we shall be compelled to drain it to the last dreg. If we persevere in the career of conquest and annexation on which we have started, our doom is sealed. The issue is as certain as the justice of Heaven.

Justinian and the civil lawyers have assigned three origins to the right of slavery,—the law of nations, the civil law, and the law of nature,—*jure gentium*, *jure civili*, and *jure naturae*. The conqueror, say the civilians, has a right to the life of his prisoner. He may, therefore, lawfully subject him to servitude, on the principle that the greater right includes the less. Again, the civil law of the Romans empowered debtors to sell themselves. And, thirdly, according to the same authorities, the law of nature requires, that the children whom a father, reduced to slavery, is no longer able to maintain, should be reduced to the same state as the father himself.

These reasons of the civilians are all false, and, of course, the pretended rights built upon them, are utterly groundless. Montesquieu and Blackstone have demolished, with cogent logic, the superstructure of Justinian. We are not going to repeat their arguments, especially, since the author of these "Thoughts" does not place himself on the ground of the civil lawyers and jurists. He traces the right of slavery to a much higher source, even to a *jus divinum*. He finds it in the curse pronounced by Noah on Canaan

and his posterity, as related in the ninth chapter of Genesis.

The writer of this pamphlet boldly avows the opinion, that negro slavery is pleasing to God, and is designed to be perpetual. He bases his defence of it on grounds which justify, not only slavery, but the slave trade, and convert the odious traffic into a solemn Christian duty. His theory is substantially embraced in the following propositions:—

Ham was an ambitious man, who seized the opportunity of his father's momentary helplessness to instigate his brothers to throw off the restraints of parental authority, and divide the inheritance. The proposal was to subvert the only human government then in existence. It was the crime of high treason, aggravated by filial impiety. Noah's situation imposed on him the obligation of maintaining and enforcing those laws which lie at the basis of civil society. This could be done no otherwise than by the institution of a system of rewards and punishments. Death would have done but half the work. Slavery does the whole, by rewarding the virtuous, at the same time that it punishes the guilty. Noah's declaration is a judicial sentence. It confers on the descendants of Shem and Japheth the right to enslave the descendants of Canaan. The penalty was not more than sufficient to insure respect for the authority of Noah as a magistrate, and secure the stability of his government. A simple order to *afflict* the children of Canaan would soon have been forgotten. Noah, therefore, united the *punishment* with a *reward*. "He awakened *cupidity*, and designated the *victim*." No limit was set to the duration of slavery. The sentence

by which it was instituted has never been revoked. The lesson it inculcates can never become obsolete. No change has taken place in the moral constitution of man, that would justify the removal of the least restraint upon vice, nor the suppression of a single incentive to virtue. The *reward* of Shem and Japheth and their posterity is inseparably connected with the *punishment* of Canaan and his posterity. While the former are entitled to slaves, the latter must bow their neck to the yoke. (pp. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 57, 58, 59.)

Such is the ground assumed by our author, stated for the most part in his own words. The malediction upon Canaan, it will be seen, he regards as a civil punishment, inflicted for the double crime of treason and filial irreverence. Noah, moved by a divine afflatus, in quality of civil ruler pronounces sentence upon a convicted culprit. And the penalty, which will not be exhausted till the last trump shall awake the dead, is not more than enough to insure a proper respect for magistrates, and secure the stability of government. Thus the essential interests of society demand that the entire race of Canaan should be reduced to bondage, converted into chattels, and held as such to the end of time. Less than this would be removing somewhat from the needful restraint upon vice; less than this would be suppressing a portion of the indispensable incentives to virtue.

The posterity of Shem and Japheth are, by the theory, charged with the execution of the sentence. It can be regarded no otherwise than as a solemn trust, committed to them by the second father of the race, acting as the head of a civil community, and



moved by an immediate divine influence. Dereliction here, it is manifest, would involve a threefold infidelity,—to God, to society, and to the sacred cause of virtue. But this trust cannot be fully discharged, so long as there remains a single descendant of Canaan free. Every individual of that unhappy race must have a chain about his neck, before virtue can receive all the incentives, and vice all the restraint, which they respectively need; and before the great cause of civil government and social order can be fully vindicated.

There is no escape from this consequence, upon the premises of this writer. If the party, charged with the execution of a penalty, may rightfully remit a portion of it, he may, by the same right, withhold the whole. And then what becomes of the dignity of government, the force of authority, and the majesty of law? What should we think of a sheriff, who, in executing the sentence of death for piracy, pronounced against a whole ship's crew, should intentionally allow three-fourths of them to escape? Could the legislator wink at such a violation of duty, without losing all self-respect, and showing an utter disregard of the public safety? If the descendants of Shem and Japheth, then, do not use their best diligence to render effective the sentence against Canaan, if they do not subjugate and enslave his posterity to the utmost of the irpower, they become *participes criminis*, and ought to be subject to the same penalty. Unless our author admits this, his whole book is a mere play upon words, and utterly unworthy of respect. Unless he admits this, he cannot claim to have settled anything; and the question remains just

as it stood before, and is to be determined upon principles which he has not so much as touched, throughout his whole discussion. Our author has discovered, to his own satisfaction, that the negroes of Africa are the true and only living descendants of Canaan. Since this is so, he is bound by his principles to exert his best endeavors to reduce them all to a state of servitude. Since this is so, he ought to devote the remainder of his days and energies to the labor of rousing Christendom to a sense of its long neglected duty. If he does not this, he is false to his own principles; false to the alleged interests of good government; false to the betrayed and suffering cause of human virtue; and false to the dread Being, whose spirit inspired the awful sentence, which the indifference and infidelity of more than forty centuries have suffered to remain still unexecuted.

Is it conceivable, is it possible, that such conclusions can be well founded? Can the *principles* be just, that lead directly to so terrible a result? The method of proof, denominated *reductio ad absurdum*, in which the falseness of the premises appears in the absurdity of the inference, has always been held to be philosophically sound. But here are principles, avowed and advocated, the inevitable issue of which would be to tear fifty millions of human beings from the soil that gave them birth; to sunder all the domestic and social ties that impart to life whatever of sweetness it has for them; and to depopulate and abandon to silence and desolation an entire continent, embracing a fourth part of the surface of the globe! And all this in the name of justice and religion! Surely, such wholesale subjugation, the infliction of a vengeance,

at the bare conception of which humanity shudders with horror, ought to rest upon a basis more substantial than a doubtful interpretation of an obscure oracle, uttered in the infancy of the world, the whole record of which and of the circumstances that gave birth to it, is contained within the compass of a half dozen brief lines. We candidly own that we do not understand that oracle. But we must avow that this writer's interpretation of it is the least satisfactory of all that have fallen under our notice.

The absurdity of our author's doctrine will be still more apparent from a consideration of the agencies, through which the penalty in question must be enforced. If there is any truth in history, or any reliance to be placed on human testimony, no other business in the world so brutalizes humanity, so eradicates from the human heart every thing like human sympathies, so dries up the very fountains of charity in the soul, as the slave trade. Nor are its effects less terrible upon its unhappy victims. Husband and wife, parent and child, brother and sister, lover and friend, are ruthlessly torn asunder, never more to look into each other's faces, never again to be solaced by the tear of sympathy, or cheered by the smile of affection. The sunshine of life is extinguished. A deep and cheerless midnight settles down upon the soul. The affections are burnt out. A chilling blight comes over the conscience. The intellect suffers a dull and fatal absorption; and nothing remains of the man, but his form. Wherefore must all this be? Why, that children may learn to respect their parents, that governments may not be subverted, that vice may be restrained, and that

virtue may lack no needful incentive. That is, in plain English, one half the human race must be transformed into demons, and the other into brutes, in order that the highest welfare of all may be vindicated and secured! Was ever such a doctrine broached before? Did ever such madness challenge the approval of reason?

The sentence pronounced upon Canaan, according to our author, was wholly an affair of civil government. It was not at all of the nature of a prediction of evils, to be inflicted by the inscrutable methods of the divine providence. It was a civil penalty, a "judicial sentence," a decree in court, clothing the children of Shem and Japheth with legitimate authority, and indeed making it their solemn duty, to enslave the children of Canaan. Is the same government, we would ask, still in being? Is any one of the numerous governments, now existing among men, its legitimate representative? If not, where is the principle laid down, in what authorities is the doctrine taught, that the statutes and judicial decrees of one civil community are binding upon others? We speak of positive enactments; for we presume that not even this writer will contend, that the law in question belongs to the department of philosophical morality, and that the obligation of it is discoverable by the light of nature.

Is this statute, then, alone of all others, binding upon all human governments? Where is the proof of it? Chapter and verse ought to be given for such a doctrine. Especially should this be so, since it is a doctrine which would impose upon many communities a duty equally repugnant to their preconceived

notions of right, their sense of humanity, and their rooted convictions of expediency. Massachusetts, for example, looks upon the slave trade as a nefarious and inhuman traffic; and she believes slavery to be as great a curse to those who inflict, as to those who suffer it. It must be a clear case of duty, that would induce the good old Bay State to abandon her present noble system of industry, as beneficent as it is peaceful; to convert her looms and spindles into slave ships, her thousands of seamen and operatives into slave hunters, and her capitalists into slave merchants; and to start upon a crusade for the subjugation and enslavement of Africa. Nor does Massachusetts, in this regard, claim to be endowed with a pre-eminent virtue and wisdom. She believes that these qualities belong equally to all the free members of our confederacy, to all the republics of this continent, and to all the states of Christian Europe. Yet if the doctrines of this book are true, all these governments are blind to duty, interest, and virtue. Their people are living in a criminal supineness and indifference to an obligation of momentous import,—an obligation, on the due discharge of which depends the safety of empires, the peace of families, the suppression of vice, and the proper encouragement and support of virtue.

In what school did our author study his principles of government? The divine providence is one thing, the civil magistrate another. God may, in his inscrutable equity, visit the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, but this lies not within the province of any secular magistracy. None but the most despotic governments, as those of Turkey and China, punish



the children for the crimes of the parent. And even they do not pursue with vengeance the distant posterity of a convicted criminal. We admit that some civilized governments of antiquity did adopt the despotic principle. But the contrary doctrine prevailed in that polity, which Moses, by the command of God, ordained for the Jews. "Parents shall not die for children, nor children for parents; every one shall die for his own sins,"—is the brief but explicit provision of the Hebrew code on this subject. What an irrepressible burst of indignation would resound through this continent, if the Supreme Court of the United States should pronounce sentence of death against a son, in consequence of the treason of his father. Such a sentence would produce, and ought to produce, a revolution in the government. But our author holds to the equity and wisdom of propagating the effects of a mere civil punishment, not to the third or fourth generation merely, but to the latest generation by which the earth shall be peopled!

Nor is this the only strange doctrine in this writer's creed of jurisprudence. He has broached another principle, equally subversive of all fairness and equity in the administration of justice. A mere order, he says, imposed on Shem and Japheth, that they and their posterity should forever afflict the children of Canaan, would have been unavailing, since it would have lacked the spur of interest. Hence CUPIDITY must be awakened, and the VICTIM designated. This is not our language, but our author's. What a picture! The executors of a judicial sentence directly interested in the penalty, and this interest not merely

incidental, but resulting from the positive intendment of the legislator! It is as if a jury, sitting in judgment on a man's life, should, in case of conviction, have the right to take possession, for their own benefit, of the millions locked up in his coffers! What government could stand, or ought to stand, for a single revolution of the seasons, with such iniquity established by law? Truly, as our author suggests, "the working of the system shows the foresight of the contriver;" but whether the origin of such a contrivance is to be sought in the supernal regions, or elsewhere, is a question about which there is room for an honest difference of opinion.

In his apology for slavery, this writer rejects all the reasons on which the civilians grounded the right of holding human beings in bondage. He equally renounces all claim of right, built upon mere prescriptive title, admitting, in the broadest terms, that, if slavery was wrong in its inception, no duration of time can make it right. He bases his justification of it upon the one clear and simple ground, that it is a rightful civil penalty, pronounced by a competent authority against the youngest son of Ham and his posterity, the effect of which is to continue to the end of time. For confirmation of his doctrine, he relies much upon the example and authority of Abraham, Moses, and Christ; the first of whom, he says, held slaves; the second admitted slavery into his civil polity; and the last, as likewise his apostles, condemned it not, either directly or indirectly,—nor said or did any thing, from which it can be fairly inferred that they considered it opposed to the doctrines they taught. Still he admits that slavery is not right

merely because it is tolerated either in the Old Testament or the New, any more than polygamy and divorce would be right for the same reason. He admits that, if this were all that could be urged in favor of it, "arguments drawn from the physical, social, and moral constitution of man might be fairly used to combat it." But he contends that the institution of slavery rests upon a deeper and firmer foundation. It is the punishment of treason and filial impiety,—a punishment essential to the security of government, the decorum of families, and the interests of virtue. That makes it right, and that alone. (pp. 15, 17, 24, 28, 52, 57 seq.)

We thank our author for the simplicity of his theory. The labor of replication is thereby greatly abridged. We are not compelled to grope our way through a labyrinth of philosophical subtleties, that constantly elude our grasp. The issue is distinctly before us. The foe does not lie in ambush, nor lurk in obscurity. We know where to find him. This is an advantage, for which, we repeat in all sincerity, we feel deeply grateful to the candor of our author.

It follows, by inevitable deduction, from the ground assumed by this writer, that his plea of justification can have no applicability whatever to the slavery of any other races, but that of Canaan. His argument does not touch the case of any others, except indeed to sweep away from it every vestige of a claim of right. Not a human being, on his principles, can be rightfully held in bondage, for a single hour, unless he belong to the accursed race.

Our author has framed an argument, which we will examine by and by, to prove that the African negroes



are the posterity of Canaan. Let us for the present assume that they are so. Since no slavery, other than of that race, is justifiable, the question of slavery, in its application to races, becomes one of capital importance. Especially and pre-eminently important is it to ascertain how far the Hebrew people confined the practice of slavery to the African negroes. Our author affirms that other races have only been occasionally enslaved; that such enslavement has been but for comparatively brief periods; that white slavery at the present time scarcely exists; that the negro race has been, almost *en masse* and throughout all time, reduced to this abject state; and that black slavery is now nearly universal. How is this?

Not one of these five propositions has any solid basis of historical proof; and most of them are directly in the face of all history. Our author himself has not attempted to argue the point. He has not adduced a single proof of his positions, but states them, as if they were so many axioms, undisputed and indisputable. Let us endeavor, in part at least, to supply his lack of historical research.

A principal occupation of the early Greeks and barbarians was piracy; for the express purpose of making slaves of whomsoever they could capture. "The Grecians," says Thucydides, "in their primitive state, as well as the contemporary barbarians, who inhabited the seacoasts and islands, addicted themselves wholly to piracy; it was their only profession and support." Were the victims of these depredations—Africans? To ask the question is to answer it. These freebooters preyed upon their neighbors, not upon a distant continent. "In Athens," observes

Burke, "there were usually from ten to thirty thousand freemen; this was the utmost. But the slaves usually amounted to four hundred thousand, and sometimes to a great many more. The freemen of Sparta were not more numerous in proportion to those whom they held in bondage." The accurate Mitford assures us, that more than four-fifths of the entire population of Greece were slaves. And Gibbon computes the number of slaves in the Roman empire at a full moiety of the entire population, or over sixty millions. How many of these may reasonably be supposed to have been negroes? Probably not a fiftieth part of them; certainly an inconsiderable fraction.

To show how little the question of races entered into the thought of those who enslaved their fellow beings, take the following incident in Athenian story. A king of Egypt sent to the Athenians a present of corn. A quarrel ensued upon the distribution of it. A mock inquiry was instituted into the title of the citizens. On a vain pretence of illegitimacy, trumped up for the occasion, the majority deprived of their share of the royal donation no less than five thousand of their own body. They went further, and disfranchised them. Not content with even this outrageous act of injustice, they proceeded to plunder them of all their substance; and, to crown the strange scene of violence and tyranny, they actually sold every man of the five thousand as slaves in the public market!

The nations of Northern Europe held innumerable bondmen. Cæsar, in the second book of his Commentaries, after relating the story of the Atuatici, and speaking of a stronghold, into which they had thrown

themselves as a last resource, says, that on the following day the gates were forced, and the whole multitude sold into slavery ; and that the number of persons thus deprived of liberty and reduced to bondage, was fifty-three thousand. Thus it would seem there was no difficulty in selling, as slaves, fifty-three thousand people at a time, in the heart of Europe. And it is to be noted, that Cæsar is giving no description here of the unhappy state of mankind at this period. No occurrence can be mentioned more as a thing of course. And such, in fact, we know, from many other sources, was the common fate of the vanquished, at a time when war was the great business of mankind. From these statements some idea may be formed of the thronging myriads of slaves in Northern Europe ; but there is not the slightest proof, or probability, that one of them had ever pressed the soil or felt the sun of Africa. Tacitus informs us that the Germans even played themselves into servitude at the gaming table. Egypt was a hotbed of slavery. The pyramids, by the admission of our author, could never have been built by free labor. Yet Mr. Gliddon, as also admitted by him, has shown that the people who reared those stupendous structures, were not of negro, but of Caucasian mould. The two million Hebrews, whom the Egyptians held in bitter bondage, were of Shemitic, not Canaanitish origin. And we find the Eastern merchants of antiquity bringing slaves into Africa, rather than carrying them out of it. (Gen. xxxvii.)

What shall be said to our author's affirmation that in our age white slavery scarcely exists, and that

black slavery is nearly universal? Does he not use his own faculties, or does he suppose that his readers will forbear the use of theirs? With the exception of a mere modicum of its territory, is there a negro slave on all this continent? Can one such be found on the soil of Europe? But does not the vast empire of Russia, on the contrary, teem with white slaves? And is not white slavery practised throughout almost the whole of Asia? It is making too little of our intelligence, or too much of our credulity, to imagine that such rashness of assertion can have any other effect, than to weaken our confidence in him who uses it.

But the most interesting part of the inquiry remains. It is in relation to the races held in bondage by the Israelites. This nation was blessed with a polity, framed by an inspired lawgiver. Great stress is laid by our author on the tolerance of slavery in his system of government. To him it is a point of fundamental importance, that none but children of the accursed race should stand in this relation to the chosen people. If any others might be lawfully held in servitude by them, if any others were so held, the example of Abraham, the authority of Moses, the forbearance of Christ, whatever they may be to others, are nothing at all to him. Unless the Hebrews restricted their practice of slavery to the negro race, all that he has said upon the subject, so far as his theory of the right of slavery is concerned, is so much air, and nothing more. Who, then, were the slaves of this people?

It is not probable that the Jews carried many, or indeed any, negroes with them out of Africa. The circumstances attending their abode in Egypt and their

departure out of it forbid such a supposition. They were prohibited by an express law from having any future intercourse with Egypt, whence alone they could have procured fresh supplies of negro slaves. They were allowed to obtain slaves of their heathen neighbors; but even here, in one direction, the command was, "Thus far, but no farther." They were, by positive enactment, restrained from making slaves of one race; and, strange to say, the interdiction was in reference to those very descendants of Canaan, who alone, according to our author's theory, might be rightfully held in bondage. These they were to exterminate, not enslave. And the contrary procedure, in reference to a handful of Gibeonites, had like to have ended in a revolution. But more than this. Hebrews themselves might, by the law of Moses, be enslaved by Hebrews. It is vain to allege that the law of servitude was somewhat milder towards them, than to other classes of bondmen. They were slaves in the strict sense, and so admitted by our author. As such, they might be bought and sold, like other slaves; and there was a provision in the code, whereby their bondage might be made perpetual.

Such was the law of Moses, and such the usage of the Jews, in the earlier periods of their commonwealth. How stood the matter in the time of our Saviour? We are spared all trouble on this point. Our author himself, quoting, with full assent, the words of Dr. Channing, says: "Slavery, in the age of Paul, was not so much of the black, as of the white man; not so much of barbarians, as of Greeks; not merely of the ignorant and debased, but of the virtuous, educated, and refined." We doubt whether



such a thing as negro slavery existed among the Israelites, from their first settlement in Canaan till their final extinction as an independent nation by the all-conquering arms of Rome. Certainly, there is not a particle of evidence to support such an opinion, while there is much of a contrary tendency.

Whither, now, does all this tend? To this point. Our author reasons thus:—Slavery is the punishment of a complex civil and social crime, of enormous magnitude. The sentence inflicting it, rightfully dooms the entire race of Canaan to servitude through all time. This interpretation of the oracle of Noah receives confirmation from the conduct of the father of the faithful, as well as from that of the founders of the two great dispensations of revealed religion. Abraham practised slavery; Moses recognised and regulated it; and Christ and his apostles neither denounced it as sinful, nor made any efforts, direct or indirect, to overthrow it.

Such is our author's argument. It is manifest that all its force depends upon a certain postulatam: viz., that the slavery known to Abraham, Moses, and Christ, was of the Canaanitish race, and no other. This element failing, the whole fabric falls to the ground. This element failing, the inference of the lawfulness of slavery from the tolerance of it by these illustrious personages, is as inconsequential as it would be if drawn from one of the demonstrations of Euclid; for, be it never forgotten, our author's entire theory rests upon no other basis than the unlawfulness and sinfulness of slavery, as practised in reference to any and all other races. But it lies upon the very surface of all history, as well sacred as

profane, that none of the nations of antiquity, that practised slavery, paid the least regard to races, in the selection of their victims, the Jews themselves forming no exception to this rule; nor does it appear to have ever entered their thought, that herein they were the ministers of a civil law, duly enacted and promulged, —the executors of a “judicial sentence,” pronounced by a civil tribunal, clothed with ample powers in the premises. This at least is certain, if there is any such thing as certainty in the world, that both Abraham and Moses gave to the oracle of Noah an interpretation different from that of our author; that the Jewish lawgiver did not admit the institution of slavery into his polity on this ground; and that the forbearance extended to it by Christ and his apostles was based upon considerations wholly unconnected with the malediction upon Canaan.

What, then, is the true relation of Judaism and Christianity to slavery? Of all the objects of human curiosity, the institutions of remote antiquity are the most difficult of investigation, and the most liable to misconception and misinterpretation. This liability to error in the study of antiquity arises partly, without doubt, from the uncertainty of its reports, but much more, from the transfer of modern ideas to those distant ages. The revolutions of time and empire are accompanied by the still more important revolutions of opinion, and each succeeding age applies its own ideas to the interpretation of all that have gone before it. But if we would grapple successfully with the study of antiquity, we must avoid this fatal mistake; we must overcome this blinding and warping power of prejudice; we must escape, as it

were, from our very selves. The gulf that separates the times we live in from the times we would investigate, must be overleaped; the intervening ages must be annihilated in our thought; the progress of man must be erased from our memory; and our whole mental being must be impregnated with the spirit and surrounded by the atmosphere of antiquity,—or we shall rush upon error, and lose ourselves in a labyrinth of false conclusions.

Let us, then, imagine the tide of time to be turned back upon itself, and, in its reflux wave, to have reached the period of the exodus of Israel out of Egypt. By what scenes are we surrounded? What sort of men do we see? In what mould are they cast? What institutions, what opinions, what manners prevail? Athletic forms, men of iron, start up on every side, like that bristling crop, which Thebes of yore saw springing from her soil. War is their business; bloodshed a holiday sport; the battle field an Elysium; human butchery their glory; and the merchandise of men as common as the merchandise of corn. Two great divisions include the whole of human kind,—the victors and the vanquished, the plunderers and the plundered, the enslavers and the enslaved. The shout of triumph, the shriek of death, the wail of despair, the sigh of captivity,—these are the sounds that continually vex the ear and oppress the heart, converting the pure breezes of heaven into ministers of sadness. Confusion, strife, tumult, injustice, tyranny, and oppression, are rife on every side. It is an age of physical development and brute force. The animal nature in man predominates over the spiritual, and his evil passions have their carnival.



But while our senses are appalled by these scenes of violence and woe, they are suddenly arrested by a vision of another sort. A true hero, a "king of men," a man endowed with every great and noble quality, appears in the midst of the nations. The force of his genius, not less than the decree of heaven, places him at the head of his countrymen,—a position which he must have reached in any age or clime. He becomes a lawgiver, which, with him, is synonymous with being a reformer. But he is not a mere philosophic dreamer, framing speculative constitutions, like Plato. His is a sterner office. Human beings, human prejudices, human passions, in all their rough reality, are the elements he has to deal with. A thousand interests claim his regard; a thousand institutions divide his thoughts. Slavery lies athwart his path. His great heart admits no sentiment, owns no sympathy, feels no pulsation, which is not with man, and for man. He knows, and he teaches, that every human being is the brother of every other. But he is a wise man, a practical man. His philosophy is not of the sort that would lose the substance in grasping at the shadow. Slavery he sees every where established. It has existed the world over from time immemorial. It is inwoven with the whole texture of society. He knows the strength of prejudice. He knows that, in order to break the force of human perversity, prudent lawgivers have always yielded, and must always yield, something to its power. He knows that the total exclusion of slavery, under such circumstances, will endanger his whole polity. But does he therefore leave the institution untouched? Far from it. He fences it with restric-

tions. He restrains its excesses. He softens its rigors. He subjects it to law. Thus he disarms it of its sting. Thus he robs it of its bitterness. Thus he almost reverses its properties. And he lays down principles of human brotherhood and equality, whose just operation and issue will be to melt down every fetter, to inspire a charity broad as the limits of humanity, and to usher in the reign of universal freedom.\*

Descend we now the stream of time, till we come to that great event,—second in importance only to the creation itself,—the birth of Christianity. We find the state of the world in many respects changed for the better. Philosophy, eloquence, poetry, music, architecture, sculpture, and painting have reached their zenith. Mind has been stirred. Thought has been developed. Government has been liberalized. A strong element of liberty has been infused into it. Manners have been refined. Truth has in some measure asserted her power. The old systems of idolatry are crumbling. The brutal element in human nature has in a degree subsided; the spiritual has proportionably advanced.

But in one particular there has been but little progress in nations not enlightened by revelation. Slavery still overspreads the nations. “It so penetrates society, and is so intimately interwoven with it, that a religion, preaching freedom to its victims, would shake

\* The actual effect of these principles may be seen in the fact, now quite commonly admitted by learned men, that slavery no longer existed among the Jews at the time of our Saviour. This is the opinion of Professor Robinson, of New York, one of the highest authorities on such subjects in this or any other country.

the social fabric to its foundations, and arm against itself the whole power of the state.”\* In the midst of this scene of things, the divine author of Christianity makes his appearance. He comes to set up a kingdom, but not of this world. He doth not strive nor cry; his rule is over the spirits of men, and its vital element is love, not force. Tumult and violence are equally abhorrent to his nature and his doctrine. Principles, ideas, thoughts, are his weapons; mightier, indeed, to the pulling down of strongholds, than the scymitar of a Saladin, or the battle-axe of a Richard; but gentle in their might, as the silent dew, or soft falling shower. Existing politics, measures of state, civil laws, he meddles not with. His mission is to preach purity and peace, not sedition and tumult. He pays tribute to Cæsar; does he therefore sanction the oppressions of Cæsar’s government? He tells the Roman soldiers to submit to their officers, and be content with their wages; is he therefore the friend of war? He does not proclaim a general insurrection of slaves; must we therefore suppose slavery to be pleasing to his just and gentle spirit? Such inferences would be as illogical, as they are unchristian; as false in philosophy, as they are in morals; as abhorrent to reason, as they are to revelation.

The apostles, schooled in the doctrine and imbued with the spirit of their Master, pursue a similar conduct. They counsel such of their disciples as are slaves, if they may be made free, to use their opportunity, for that liberty is better than bondage. At the same time, themselves profoundly absorbed in the thought of another life, they labor to impress upon

\* Rev. Dr. Channing.

their followers the animating conviction, that all the distinctions of time fade away before the stupendous realities of eternity. The Christian bondman may meekly bear the wrongs and indignities of his condition, for angels are his ministers. He can endure with patience even the agonies of torture, for he is heir to a throne, compared with which the sceptre of the Cæsars is unworthy of a thought; and the twinkle of a star is but a feeble image to express the briefness of the period that divides him from his inheritance. To a mind intent upon immortal glory, to the expectant of a heavenly dignity, as lasting as it is exalted, a crown and a dungeon are one and the same thing. Bonds, stripes, imprisonments, tortures, all the injustice of men and rancor of devils, are light afflictions, designed to work out an exceeding and eternal weight of glory. They are a school, a discipline, a medicine, painful to the body but healthful to the spirit; and, therefore, when sent in the providence of God, to be embraced, prized, and used, as the occasions and instruments of virtue.

This is the doctrine of Christ and his apostles on the subject of slavery. This is the extent of their tolerance of it. This exhausts the sanction which they give it. They do not touch the question in a civil point of view. They decide absolutely nothing, either for or against it, as an institution of civil government. It did not comport with the nature of their work to do so. The weapons of their warfare were not carnal, but spiritual. They went directly to the sources of action. The triumph at which they aimed was of virtue over vice, not of one form of civil polity over another. Revolutions of mighty import were in

their thought; but not one of them was to be effected by the sword. They preached ideas, not legions and phalanxes. Brotherhood, equality, charity, justice, benignity, a common Father, a common immortality, a common redemption, a common heaven,—these great thoughts were the burden of their doctrine. In these principles, behold their instruments of subjugation, and the panoply in which they arrayed themselves. In this armor they fought; by this token they conquered. Our author seems to mistake the essential nature of Christianity. “Where is the difference,” says he, “between assailing slavery with the tone and gesture of a modern abolitionist, and taking the course secretly to undermine it, which they say the apostle Paul adopted?” He might as reasonably ask, wherein consists the difference between counselling the slave to use a stiletto upon his master, and teaching the master that his bondman is a brother, created, equally with himself, in the image of God, and equally the object of his paternal care and benediction. Silence is stronger than noise, the stillness of midnight more impressive than the roar of thunder, the law of love mightier than the law of force. The cold north wind, roaring and sweeping over the plain, causes the traveller to draw his mantle more closely around him; but the silent heat of the sun makes him relax his grasp, and cast the garment away, as a useless burden. Is there no means of reforming a drunkard, but by getting him to sign the temperance pledge? That method is good, but there is a “more excellent way.” Let but the love of God enter and penetrate his soul, and the work is far more effectually accomplished. The impulse is now from within.



The motive power lies deeper, and its operation is more constant.

Throughout the whole realm of nature, silent influences are the most powerful. Gravitation and the mysterious chemistry of vegetable life,—how noiseless and gentle is their operation ! Yet the one drives the planets, with an inconceivable velocity, through the fields of space ; and the other, with each revolving season, repairs the decays of nature, clothing the earth afresh with beauty and riches. Thus it is also in the moral world. The utmost strength of logic, rhetoric, and eloquence, and all the force of genius, is as nothing, when compared with the unconscious power of example, the silent energy of virtue. On this principle, the Saviour and his apostles acted in regard to abuses of government and legalized oppressions. They did not speak evil of dignities. They did not attack the civil magistracy. They did not instigate to violence and tumult. They set on foot no schemes of rebellion and revolution. But they did that which was better. They announced doctrines, they proclaimed ideas, they taught principles, whose unperceived operation would be more effective than millions of bayonets. Reason declares, and history confirms, the wisdom of their course.

We must not omit to notice, in this connection, an opinion of our author, which we cannot but regard as derogatory to Christianity and its divine founder. He denies that the Bible has had any influence in the abolition of slavery, and even frames an argument to prove the truth of the denial. The puritans, those deep students and zealous defenders of the Bible, held slaves. Massachusetts even had no religious scruples

nor was Christianity a motive with her in discarding the system. Clarkson's opposition was not based upon the Bible. And, until recently, all Christendom remained profoundly ignorant of the fact, that the tendency of the Bible is to undermine and destroy slavery! (p 56).

All this sounds oddly enough. Let us subject it to the crucible. It seems to us that our author is as unfortunate with his history, as he is with his philosophy. Slavery originated at a very remote period. Egypt became, as we learn from Homer, in the earliest ages, the great slave-market of the world. Thence it travelled all over Asia. It spread through the Grecian and Roman world. It was established among the barbarous nations that overturned the Roman empire. Thus it appears that the roots of this system had struck into the soil of every region of the globe, and its branches overspread the earth. This state of things continued till the Christian religion established its empire throughout the Roman world. Then it was that the system began to crumble and totter. The leaven of Christianity began to work. The doctrines,—clearly revealed in the new religion,—that all men are equal, that God is no respecter of persons, that men are free agents, that free agency implies accountability, that accountability requires its subjects to be masters of themselves, that the whole human race ought to be united by the bond of love into a common brotherhood,—could not fail to open the eyes of those who felt the power of Christianity to the wrong there is in slavery. Accordingly, we find such persons beginning to be actuated by these principles. One, and another, and another, grants

charters of manumission to his slaves, “*pro amore Dei, pro mercede animæ.*” These charters were grounded wholly on religious considerations. They were given to procure the favor of God, which the slave-owners conceived themselves to have forfeited, by the subjugation of those, whom they now found to be, equally with themselves, the objects of divine benevolence. These considerations, having their origin in Christianity, wrought more and more, as the different nations were converted, till, towards the close of the twelfth century, slavery had been abolished, and general liberty established, in the west of Europe.\* The late Dr. Arnold, than whom no man was better able to form, or more conscientious in the utterance of opinions on this subject, says, that emancipation, in the middle ages, was largely effected by the influence of Christianity; and that the Church was not slow in urging, in this instance, a full compliance with the spirit of the gospel.

But soon Christianity itself began to be corrupted, and its vital power to depart. What followed? Slavery re-appeared in those very nations that had before renounced it, “for the love of God and the benefit of their souls.” The Portuguese, in imitation of the early piracies mentioned by Thucydides, descended upon Africa, ravaged the coast, and carried off all whom they could capture. This practice, inconsiderable at first, by degrees became general. Spain, France, Great Britain, and most of the maritime powers of Europe, followed the piratical example of Portugal. Thus did the Europeans, to their eternal

\* Rees’s Encl. Art. “Slavery.”



infamy, revive a custom which their ancestors had exploded from an apprehension of its impiety.

Christianity continued to degenerate, and slavery and the slave trade kept pace with its downward progress, till it became unable to support the burden of its own corruptions. The Reformation followed. The most pressing evils first felt the power of its returning life. Slavery addresses itself to some of the strongest passions of our nature, the love of power, the thirst of gain, and the appetite of pleasure. It is not strange that it should have long maintained its ascendancy over the minds of even good men. But its turn came. Truth is great, and will prevail. The history given above may be considered as substantially re-written here. And at the present day, so far as Christendom is concerned, slavery is confined to an inconsiderable fraction of its territories. In the face of such facts as these, who shall dare affirm that the spirit of Christianity is not opposed to the traffic in men, the merchandize of human blood and sinews? And where did our author learn that the Bible had no share in the abolition of slavery in the free States of this Union? Our ancestors called it a "war against human nature;" "an execrable commerce;" "a piratical warfare;" "the opprobrium of infidel powers;" and, with the bitterest irony, "the warfare of the CHRISTIAN king of Great Britain!"\* In what school had they learned to apply such epithets to slavery? Did the code of Lycurgus, or Solon, or Numa supply them? Did they herein follow the lead of Plato, or Aristotle, or Cicero, or Justinian? No! Nothing approaching such views could have been

\* Original Draft the Declaration Independence.

learned from any of these masters. The Bible, and that alone, had taught them in what colors to paint the horrid traffic.

One further point in our author's essay demands some examination. It is the argument by which he attempts to prove that the negroes of Africa are the descendants of Canaan. Briefly stated, it runs thus:—Canaan and his posterity were doomed to servitude. Their brethren, the posterity of Ham, had the same right as Shem and Japheth, to enslave them. Noah assigned Africa to Ham, and the poorest part of Africa to Canaan, as being the worst member of that bad family. When the other sons of Ham went to take possession of their allotment, some of the children of Canaan probably accompanied them as slaves. Many of these, finding slavery a bitter thing, escaped from their masters, and fled into the interior of Africa. Here, protected by the unwholesomeness of the climate, they have ever since lived and multiplied, the great seminary and workshop of slaves. The curse of slavery has never been revoked. It is natural to suppose that God should have set some unmistakable mark upon the posterity of Canaan. Degradation, barbarism, color, are brands that “defy erasure or concealment.” The Africans are *negroes*. The Africans are *savages*. The Africans are sunk to the *lowest deeps of degradation*. THEREFORE, the Africans are the posterity of Canaan, and justly liable to all the pains and penalties of the original sentence of subjection.—(pp 59, 60, 61, 66, 67.)

Such is the argument, fairly stated, though in a condensed form. Let us try its force. “Noah assigned Africa to Ham.” This is a pure historical

fiction ; often repeated, it is true, but none the less a fiction. There is not only no proof to sustain it, but there is much to overthrow it. Ham had four sons, Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan. Nimrod, one of the five sons of Cush, founded an empire in the heart of Asia ; and three of the other four are believed by Bochart, Le Clerc, Michaelis, and other learned men, who have studied the subject, to have settled on the same continent. The descendants of Mizraim did probably colonize portions of Africa, as the Egyptians are called in the Hebrew Bible “Mitzraim,” and their country, to this day, is generally known, throughout the East, as the “land of Mitze.” Of the country occupied by Phut, nothing is said in the scriptures ; nor is it even stated whether he had any posterity. But the descendants of Canaan are distinctly enumerated, and their boundary marked with great exactness. Their country extended from Sidon on the north to the farther extremity of the Dead Sea on the south. It did not touch Africa in any part.

It is of material importance to our author to identify the posterity of Canaan. This he despairs of doing, unless he can find them within the charmed circle of the African negroes. Therefore, as there is no evidence that the Asiatic Canaanites were black, he informs us, contrary to all the historical probabilities of the case, that these, after the loss of their country, became extinct. But let him have a care that he do not cut too deep. These Asiatics comprehended the whole race. This is distinctly declared in the tenth chapter of Genesis, if language can so declare it. What, then, becomes of his assertion, that Canaan had other sons, to whom the poorest part of Africa

was assigned, on account of their bad eminence in crime? Or can he explain why any portion of the earth should be ASSIGNED to a race doomed to perpetual servitude? It is not common for slaves to be the owners of land.

But the other sons of Ham, says our author, had the same right to enslave the children of Canaan, which the posterity of Shem and Japheth had. Whence did they get that right? It is not in the words of Noah. And if it were, what a strange spectacle would be presented to us! According to this writer, "the servitude of Canaan was among the good things included in the benediction of Shem and Japheth." The oracle of Noah, like the pillar of cloud, had a double aspect. It lowered darkly in one direction; it shone out brightly in another. Again and again does he declare the slavery of Canaan to be a *blessing* to Shem and Japheth, and so intended. To the former, it was the punishment of a crime; to the latter, the reward of a virtue. Well, the other sons of Ham, Cush, and Phut, and Mizraim, we now learn, are entitled to the *same* blessing. We have, then, this case, the like of which we defy the whole tribe of antiquaries to produce out of all the records of jurisprudence. A man commits an enormous crime. He is tried and convicted. He himself is reprieved, and suffers nothing. But one fourth of his posterity is *punished*, and the other three fourths are *rewarded*, for his crime, to the end of time! Could absurdity go beyond that?

Our first emotion is one of amazement, that the writer of the pamphlet should have admitted such an excrescence upon his theory. But a little reflection

satisfies us that he could not get along without it. It plays an important part in his chain of evidence, or, more properly, of assumptions, with respect to the paternity of the negroes. How else could these people ever have made their way into Africa! Now, nothing more natural. When their uncles and cousins emigrate to take possession of their allotted continent, some members of the accursed race accompany them as slaves. But they do not like their chains. Finding their lot a hard one, they run away from their masters, and take refuge in the swamps and deserts of interior Africa. Here, protected by pestilential heats and vapors, they increase and multiply to a great nation, ready to be caught, chained, scourged, turned into property, and bought and sold as chattels, by Christians, for the suppression of vice and the encouragement of virtue. But all this while, our author forgets that, in another part of his book, he has admitted that the earliest slaves of the Egyptians were of Caucasian, not Canaanitish, origin. Or, if there is no slip in his memory, how does he reconcile the two theories?

The suggestion of an antecedent probability, that the Deity, having doomed a certain race to perpetual bondage, would affix a brand mark upon it, "defying erasure and concealment," and of the further probability that this mark is the blackness of the Africans, is worthy of a thoughtful and philosophic mind. For, as our author ingeniously insinuates, if the color of these people is not a miraculous token of their liability to servitude, whence came it? and if it does not mean,—“this man is a slave,”—what does it mean? We certainly intend no disrespect to the



writer, but his reasoning irresistibly reminds us of an argument in support of African slavery, suggested by the Baron de Montesquieu, which, after all, strikes us as the very best that can be offered in its behalf:—

“Were I to vindicate our right to make slaves of the negroes,” says that illustrious author, “these should be my arguments. These creatures are all over black, and with such a flat nose that they can scarcely be pitied. It is hardly to be believed that God, who is a wise being, should place a soul, especially a good soul, in such a black and ugly body. It is so natural to look upon color as the criterion of human nature, that the Asiatics, among whom eunuchs are employed, always deprive the blacks of their resemblance to us, by a more opprobrious distinction. The color of the skin may be determined by that of the hair, which, among the Egyptians, the wisest philosophers in the world, was of such importance, that they put to death all the red-haired men, who fell into their hands. The negroes prefer a glass necklace to that gold which polite nations so highly value. Can there be a greater proof of want of reason? It is impossible to suppose these creatures to be men, because, allowing them to be men, a suspicion would follow, that we ourselves are not Christians.”

But, in all soberness, what basis is this, on which our author proposes to ground a conviction for high treason of fifty millions of men? It is *assumed*, that Noah gave Africa to Ham. It is *assumed*, that Ham's other children, equally with the children of Shem and Japheth, had the right to enslave the posterity of Canaan. It is *assumed*, that the Asiatic Canaanites,



after the loss of their country, became extinct. It is *assumed*, that Canaan had other sons, who accompanied their brethren into Egypt as slaves. It is *assumed*, that many of these ran away from their masters, and found refuge in the interior of Africa. It is *assumed*, that God miraculously changed the color of their skin, and made it black, as an ineffaceable and unmistakable brand of servitude. And, finally, it is *assumed*, that these runaway slaves have lived, and grown, and become a numerous people, covering at the present day almost the entire continent of Africa.

All this is taken for granted, without one solitary word, in the form of proof or argument, in support of it. And from these *assumptions*, it is *inferred* that the present negroes of Africa are the posterity of Canaan. But what sort of evidence is this? It would not suffice to indentify a culprit, brought up, in an alderman's court, on a charge of petty larceny. Yet this book regards it as a warrant for entering Africa with sword and manacles, and for carrying desolation to every hearth and every heart throughout its broad expanse.

Let us, in conclusion, briefly retrace our steps, and gather up the results of our inquiries.

Our author, we have seen, affirms that Ham was a bold, ambitious man; that his crime was high treason; that the oracle of Noah was a purely civil sentence; that the punishment of Canaan was intended to be at the same time the reward of Shem and Japheth; that both the punishment and the reward were designed to be perpetual; that their perpetuity is essential to the interests of good government; that

the other children of Ham had the same right to enslave the children of Canaan, that Shem and Japheth had; that Noah assigned Africa to Ham; that he assigned the worst part of Africa to Canaan; that the children of Canaan came into Africa as slaves to the other sons of Ham; that many of them ran away from their masters, and took refuge in interior Africa; and that the color of the Africans is a miraculous sign denoting their descent from Canaan, and marking them out for slavery through all time. All these asseverations, which are made as if they announced so many long settled and undisputed truths, are pure assumptions, unsupported by a single particle of proof, scriptural, historical, or rational. Our author's further assertions, that other races than the Canaanitish have been only occasionally, and for brief periods, enslaved; that white slavery at the present time scarcely exists; and that black slavery is now, as always, nearly universal,—are still worse, as they contradict the clearest records, both of the past and the present. But the boldest, as well as the most unwarrantable denial of history we ever met with, is contained in the declaration that, in whatever countries slavery has been abolished, the Bible has had no influence or agency in the blessed work. Where, but in Christian countries, has slavery ever been abolished? If this abolition has not been effected by Christianity, what are the influences which have achieved it? And why have not the same influences wrought similar results elsewhere? Our author avers, that it was not the Bible, but the “horrors of the middle passage,” which prompted Wilberforce, Clarkson, and their philanthropic compeers, in the benevolent effort

to abolish slavery and the slave trade. But what inspired their detestation of these "horrors?" What prompted their sympathy for the wretched victims of them? Did the "horrors" of ancient slavery, every way equal to those of the "middle passage," induce such sentiments in the most illustrious statesmen and sages of antiquity? Where was this sympathy in Cæsar, when he related the sale of fifty thousand slaves, as the result of a single battle, with as much coolness as he would have told of the death of a cat? Where slept this sympathy in Cato, that "noblest Roman of them all," when he declared that an old plough and a worn out slave ought to be treated in the same manner? What had become of this sentiment of brotherhood in Vedio Apollo, the intimate of Augustus, when he cut his slaves in pieces, to feed his pet fishes with their flesh? To what savage beasts had fled the humanity of the universal Roman heart, when an entire island in the Tiber was appropriated to the reception of aged, infirm, and incurable slaves; whither they were sent, not to receive the solaces of assiduous nursing by gentle hands, but to enjoy the miserable boon,—yet the kindest their masters ever bestowed upon them,—to expire! The whole pagan world, in all the ages, never produced the heart of a Wilberforce; yet the Christian world, imperfect and partial as has ever been the infusion of Christ's spirit into its members, has produced millions of them. To exclude Christianity from this result would be as unphilosophical, as it would be insulting to its divine Author.

But the CONSEQUENCES resulting from these assumed premises, are strange, startling, and even terrific.

A mere civil penalty may, without a violation of justice, be propagated through a long series of ages, nay, through all the ages of time! The judicial decrees of one government may rightfully bind all other governments! The executors of a sentence, pronounced by a civil tribunal, may properly have a pecuniary interest in the infliction of the punishment for which it calls; thus making "cupidity" a proper motive to the discharge of their trust, and converting the poor culprits into "victims" of this "cupidity!" The original perpetrator of a crime may be rightfully reprieved, and escape all punishment; while, at the same time, a part of his posterity shall be justly punished, and another part as justly rewarded, for his act, through all time! Strange as these issues are, others, of a still more fearful import, are yet behind. The whole continent of Africa is peopled by a race doomed to perpetual bondage, as the just punishment of a crime committed in the very infancy of our race. The African slave-trade is a pious traffic, not lawful merely to the rest of the world, but actually obligatory upon it; not permitted only, but demanded, by the inspired oracles of God. Every negro, not already in slavery, is a fugitive from justice; and it is the solemn duty of Christians so to regard and treat him. They are bound to seize and enslave every such individual, whenever and wherever they encounter him. Manumission, emancipation, the release of the captive, the "setting at liberty of them that are bound," is a subversion of justice, a warfare upon virtue, an immorality, nay, a rebelling against Heaven. Our noble Washington, and other humane and philanthropic slave-owners, in freeing their negroes, have ranged them-

selves among the subverters of government and the enemies of mankind. Every State that has abolished slavery, in this Union and throughout the world, has taken part in the same unholy work. The entire colonization movement, which has resulted in the establishment of a free, independent, civilized, and Christian republic in Africa, is a direct warfare at once against the sovereign decree of Heaven and the highest interest and welfare of man. The martyr Asimun; the gentle Gurley; the noble-hearted Bethune; the patriarchal Alexander; the devoted, self-sacrificing missionary, who, glowing with the fervors of an apostolic sympathy and zeal, has braved the terrors of an African climate and the still greater terrors of African barbarism, to proclaim the unsearchable riches of the gospel to that dark land; and the venerable Missionary Boards, in this and other countries, who have sent these men there, together with the contributors to their funds, who have approved therein their action, have all mistaken their real duty to Africa and the true teachings of the Bible in reference to it. Instead of merchantmen, they should have sent thither slave ships; instead of missionaries, kidnappers; instead of Bibles, manacles; instead of free institutions and prosperity, bondage and desolation; and death in the place of life!

These, each and all, are the just issues of the doctrines of this book. The strongest ground of support to these doctrines, indeed the only ground, is the tolerance of slavery by Moses and the non-interference with it by Christ. But, unless it can be shown,—which it clearly cannot, being contrary to all history and all probability,—that Hebrew slavery was of the African



race, even this ground slips away from under our author, leaving his theory the mere wreck of a fancy, the baseless and dissolving fabric of a vision.

Having, as we trust, refuted, one by one, our author's positions, having demolished his logical, or rather, his imaginative castle, we might have foreborne further labor. We had done all that could be fairly demanded in a review and confutation of his pamphlet. But we have gone farther. By exhibiting the relation of Judaism and Christianity to slavery, we have shown, that, even if the Hebrews had restricted their practice of slavery to the Canaanitish race, their example and the conduct of Moses and Christ afford no support to the system of slavery, much less to our author's particular theory of it. Moses tolerated it on the ground of political expediency; from a dread of innovating too much; from an apprehension that the shock occasioned to men's prejudices by its total abolition would endanger his whole polity. Christ tolerated it, or rather refrained from denouncing it in terms, because of the incompatibility of such a procedure with the nature and object of his mission. Both were enemies to the system. Both taught the full equality and brotherhood of mankind. Both proclaimed the universal fatherhood of God. Both set in motion influences, whose natural tendency, and whose actual operation was, to abolish slavery. Judaism had abolished it among the Jews at the coming of Christ. Christianity had abolished it among Christians near the close of the twelfth century of our era. It reappeared under the corrupt and lifeless ritualism, but one remove from downright paganism, which preceded the Reformation. Since that time, there has been



a continual struggle between the system of slavery and the system of Christianity. Both the nature of this contest, and the results which have thus far attended it, distinctly proclaim, on which side victory may ultimately be expected. The principle of equality, of brotherhood, of an all-embracing charity, which pervades the whole Christian system, is predestined to a universal triumph over the pride, the selfishness, the prejudice, and the inhumanity, in which alone the system of slavery finds soil and sustenance.

To conclude : The whole doctrine of this book is of the past,—the dark, stern, iron past. The present age is against such teaching. Civilization is against it. The Bible is against it. The universal heart of Christendom is against it. All the movements of the world are against it. Thank Heaven ! the bounds of slavery are set. Not an inch, not a hair's breadth, shall its area be enlarged. Hitherto, but no further ! Let constitutional rights be respected ; but let there be no enlargement of the slave territory of the Union.

Victory is a word which has of late become familiar to our ear. Its shout has gone up from a hundred battle fields, in the sweet valleys and amid the wild mountain passes of Mexico. But on a different field, and with other weapons, a triumph has still more recently been gained, surpassing in sublimity the victories of Taylor and of Scott, even as the spiritual transcends the material, and the power of truth out-vies the power of the sword. The vote by which involuntary servitude has been forever excluded from the Oregon territory, is the pledge of similar triumphs, when the same contest shall be renewed on the soil of New Mexico and California. If the friends of

human freedom be but true to their cause and to themselves, we shall be spared the humiliation of adding to the crime of national plunder, the deeper, darker stain of filling regions, now happily exempt from such evils, with the clank, the tears, and the blight of slavery. Spirit of Wilberforce, of Clarkson, and of Channing, breathe upon our heart, and arm us for the conflict !



